

TRANSLATION of related part of Form PCT/ISA/237

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From Japanese Patent Office

(INTERNATIONAL SEARCH AUTHORITY)

To: HAYASE, Kenichi HAYASE & CO. 13F, NISSAY SHIN-OSAKA Bldg., 3-4-30, Miyahara, Yodogawa-ku, Osaka-shi, Osaka 532-0003 JAPAN	PCT WRITTEN OPINION OF THE ISA (PCT Rule 43bis) Date of Mailing 05 April 2005
--	--

Applicant's or agent's file reference P36994-P0	See item 2 below for the subsequent procedure	
International application No. PCT/JP2004/019059	International filing date 21 December 2004	Priority date 22 December 2003
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC Int. Cl. ⁷ G03B21/14, G09F9/00, G09F9/30, G02F1/13, H04N9/31		
Applicant Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd.		

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- I ☒ Basis of the opinion
- II ☐ Priority
- III ☐ Non-establishment of report with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability
- IV ☒ Lack of unity of invention
- V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 43.2.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- VI ☐ Certain documents cited
- VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
- VIII ☒ Certain observations on the international application

OMISSION (2 and 3)

Date of completion of this opinion 22 March 2005

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP Japanese Patent Office	Authorized officer Telephone No.
--	---

ATTACHMENT E

TRANSLATION of related part of Form PCT/ISA/237

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE ISA

International application No. PCT/JP2004/019059
--

I. Basis of the opinion

1. This opinion has been drawn on the basis of the language of international application, unless otherwise indicated below.

OMISSION(2, 3, and 4)

10/584074

TRANSLATION of related part of Form PCT/ISA/237

AP3 Rec'd PCT/PTO 22 JUN 2006

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE ISA

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/019059

IV. Lack of unity of invention

1. In response to the invitation to pay additional fees the applicant has:

☒ not paid additional fees.2. ☐ This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite the applicant to pay additional fees.

3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is

☒ not complied with for the following reasons:

The inventions disclosed in Claims 1-10 have the construction disclosed in Claim 1, as a common technical matter.

However, as a result of investigation, it becomes apparent that the common technical matter is a prior art which has conventionally been known, as is shown in the following partial international search.

Consequently, the above-mentioned technical matter is not a specific technical feature within the meaning of PCT rule 13.2, 2nd sentence.

Accordingly, there is no technical matter common to the above-mentioned respective Claims.

Further, since there exists no other common technical matter that is considered to be a specific technical feature within the meaning of PCT rule 13.2, 2nd sentence, it is impossible to find a technical relationship within the meaning of PCT rule 13, between the inventions of difference technical matters.

Accordingly, Claims are separated into nine invention groups as follows: Claims 1 and 2, Claim 3, Claim 4, Claim 5, Claim 6, Claim 7, Claim 8, Claim 9, and Claim 10.

However, Claim 4, Claim 5, Claim 6, Claim 7, and Claim 10 are not regarded as additional inventions, because these Claims are within the range that is described in the prior art documents for Claims 1 and 2 and therefore a burden of new search is not particularly required.

4. Consequently, the following parts of the international application were the subject of written opinion:

☒ the parts relating to claims Nos. 1, 2, 4-7, 10

TRANSLATION of related part of Form PCT/ISA/237

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE ISA

International application No. PCT/JP2004/019059
--

V Reasoned statement under Rule 43.2.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. STATEMENT

Novelty (N)

Claims	NONE	YES
Claims	1, 2, 4-7, 10	NO

Inventive Step(IS)

Claims	NONE	YES
Claims	1, 2, 4-7, 10	NO

Industrial Applicability (IA)

Claims	1, 2, 4-7, 10	YES
Claims	NONE	NO

2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Document 1: JP 4-263244 A
Document 2: JP 10-333599 A
Document 3: JP 2000-162548 A

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 10

Documents 1-3 disclose that, in a means for forming a two-dimensional image using lights from three-color light sources, a center wavelength of a blue light source is not less than 420nm and not larger than 455nm, a center wavelength of a red color source is not less than 635nm and not larger than 655nm, and a center wavelength of a green light source is not less than 505nm and not larger than 550nm.

Further, using semiconductor lasers as light sources is described in document 2.

Accordingly, the inventions relating to Claims 1, 2, 4-7, and 10 are denied in novelty and inventive step by the documents 1-3.

TRANSLATION of related part of Form PCT/ISA/237

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE ISA

International application No. PCT/JP2004/019059
--

VIII. Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

Although it is described in Claim 10 that "having a spectrum width that is equal to or smaller than that of a semiconductor laser source", it is unclear how much width is specifically indicated by "equal to or smaller than that of a semiconductor laser source", and further, an accurate definition for "spectrum width" is also unclear.